

REMARKS

In the above-referenced Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 8-14, 18-20, 31-34, 38-44, 48-50, 61-64, 68-74, 78-80 and 91-105 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Olich (U.S. 5,298,904). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the above rejections.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Claims (as recited in independent Claims 1, 31, 61 and 91 and included by dependence by all other Claims) recite several key features that are not taught in or suggested by Olich. In particular, the master unit 21 phase comparator 275 of Olich does not detect the phase of the returned carrier signals, only the phase of the IF (difference or sum) frequency set at the remote transceiver by the phase lock loop circuit in the remote receiver. Second, while two discrete frequencies are transmitted in sequence by the master unit 21, the remote unit 23 transmits only one frequency (318Mhz as recited in col. 9 line 61 to col. 10 line 21 of Olich and observable by the fact that remote unit 23 transmits the oscillator 329 signal). Therefore, the receiver in master unit 21 does not receive "a second RF signal including a sequence of carriers corresponding to the carriers of the first RF signal" as recited in the Claims. The receiver in master unit 21 receives only a single frequency. Further, the processor in master unit 21 cannot "calculate an estimated slope of the sequence of phase offsets relative to the frequencies of the second RF signal" as the second RF signal in Olich only has one frequency. Thus Applicants believe that Claims 1, 31 and 61 as well as all claims depending therefrom should be allowed.

Claim 91 recites a method requiring reception of a sequence of signals having multiple carriers at different frequencies wherein each of the multiple carriers are phase coherent with the transmitted first signal, generating multiple phase offsets between the first and second signal, and calculating an estimated slope of phase offsets vs. the frequencies of the received signal. For the same reasons stated above with respect to Claims 1, 31 and 61 the combination of elements of Claim 91 is not taught or suggested by the Olich. Thus Applicants believe that Claim 91 and claims depending therefrom should be allowed.

Therefore, Applicants believe that the rejections under  
under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) are overcome.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that this Response, in view of the Remarks offered in conjunction therewith, is fully responsive to all aspects of the objections and rejections tendered by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that they have demonstrated that the above-identified Patent Application, including Claims 1-20, 31-50, 61-80 and 91-105, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew M. Harris  
Reg. 42,638  
(706) 782-9683  
Weiss, Moy & Harris, P.C.  
4204 North Brown Ave.  
Scottsdale, AZ 85251